



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/818,062

03/26/2001

Sriram Haridas

81862.P214

9158

8791

7590

06/15/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

SALL, EL HADJI MALICK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/818,062	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARIDAS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> El Hadji M. Sall	<b>Art Unit</b> 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 28, 2006. Claims 26-50 are pending. Claims 26-50 represent method and system for voice multicast hardware accelerator.

2. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 26-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee U.S. 6,959,072 in view of Isaka U.S. 6,654,455.

Lee teaches the invention substantially as claimed including apparatus and method for recording/reproducing voice message in exchange system having Internet gateway (see abstract).

As to claims 26, 31, 36, 41 and 46, Lee teaches a method performing voice multicasting with a router, a digital processing system, an apparatus, a network device and a medium storing instructions, the instructions to be processed by a processing unit to perform an operation comprising:

Receiving a network packet that includes voice data (column 2, lines 10-12);

Storing the voice data in a memory (column 2, lines 24-25);

Generating a voice packet that includes a digital signal processing (DSP) mask field (column 3, lines 30-36);

Sending the voice packet to a line card having a plurality of ports (column 2, lines 10-14, Lee discloses the Internet gateway includes a DSP that supports a plurality of ports, which receives the voice message from the subscriber telephone unit);

Retrieving the voice data from the memory (column 3, lines 51-53); and

transmitting the voice data on the plurality of ports as selected by the DSP mask field (column 3, lines 51-53; column 2, lines 10-14).

Lee fails to teach explicitly multicasting the voice data on the plurality of ports as selected by the DSP mask field.

However, Isaka teaches multicasting using multicast router (figure 5, item 70; column 2, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lee by substituting interface 30 with the multicast router of Isaka to provide multicasting the voice data on the plurality of ports as selected by the DSP mask field. One would be motivated to do so to allow the network with multicasting ability (abstract).

As to claims 27, 32, 37, 42 and 47, Lee teaches the method, the digital processing system, the apparatus, the network device and the medium of claims 26, 31, 36, 41 and 46, wherein the DSP mask field comprise a bit field map having a plurality of bits in which each one of the plurality of bits selects one of the corresponding plurality of ports (column 2, lines 44-59, Lee discloses plurality of ports and determining which DSP port is available, and outputting the port information and the number of the corresponding voice message (i.e. by definition, a digital signal processing unit includes a plurality of bit group digital signal processors for receiving the plurality of bit groups); figure 3A).

As to claims 28, 33, 38, 43 and 48, Lee teaches the method, the digital processing system, the apparatus, the network device and the medium of claims 26, 31, 36, 41 and 46, wherein the voice packet further includes descriptor fields for retrieving the voice data from the memory for multicasting (column 7, line 67 to column 8, line 2).

Art Unit: 2157

As to claims 29, 34, 39, 44 and 49, Lee teaches the method, the digital processing system, the apparatus, the network device and the medium of claims 26, 31, 36, 41 and 46, wherein multicasting the voice data is without duplicating packets (column 3, lines 51-53; column 2, lines 10-14).

As to claims 30, 35, 40, 45 and 50, Lee teaches the method, the digital processing system, the apparatus, the network device and the medium of claims 26, 31, 36, 41 and 46, wherein the network packet is an Internet Protocol (IP) packet (column 4, lines 22-28).

## **7. *Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 03/28/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) As to claims 26, 31, 36, 41, and 46, Applicant argues that the Examiner asserts that Lee teaches a method for performing voice multicasting that includes generating a voice packet that includes a digital signal processing (DSP) mask field citing column 3, lines 30-36. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In regards to point (A), examiner respectfully disagrees.

Column 3, lines 30-36, Lee discloses the present invention records and reproduces (i.e. generates) outgoing voice messages using an Internet gateway having

Art Unit: 2157

a digital signal processing (DSP) (i.e. that is a special-purpose CPU used for digital signal processing applications).

(B) Applicant argues that the Examiner asserts however, Isaka teaches multicasting using multicast router (figure 5, item 70, column 2, lines 1-10). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In regards to point (A), examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner is referring Applicant again to figure 5, item 70 and column 2, lines 1-10 where Isaka clearly discloses the claimed invention.

(C) Applicant argues that neither Isaka nor Lee disclose generating a voice packet that includes a digital signal processing (DSP) mask field nor multicasting the voice data on the plurality of ports as selected by the DSP mask field as claimed. Lee and Isaka fail to disclose all claim limitations. Furthermore, Applicant argues that therefore there is no motivation to apply techniques for telephone conferencing of Isaka to the techniques for delivery of a recorded message to a calling subscriber of Lee.

In regards to point (C), examiner respectfully disagrees.

Lee teaches generating a voice packet that includes a digital signal processing (DSP) mask field (column 3, lines 30-36).

Isaka teaches multicasting using multicast router (figure 5, item 70; column 2, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lee by substituting interface 30 with the multicast router of Isaka to provide multicasting the voice data on the plurality of ports as selected by the DSP mask field. One would be motivated to do so to allow the network with multicasting ability (abstract).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, One would be motivated to do so to allow the network with multicasting ability (abstract).

(D) As to claims 27, 32, 37, 42, and 47, Applicant argues that the Examiner asserts that Lee teaches the DSP mask field comprising a bit field map having a plurality of bits in which each one of the plurality of bits selects one of the corresponding plurality of ports (column 2, lines 44-59). The Examiner argues that Lee discloses plurality of ports and determining which DSP port is available, and outputting the port information and the number of the corresponding voice message. The Examiner argues that, by definition, a digital signal processing unit includes a plurality of bit group digital signal processors for receiving the plurality of bit groups (figure 3A). Applicant



Art Unit: 2157

respectfully disagrees. Figure 3A. shows a DSP table including DSP identity, port corresponding to the DSP, and state of the port as enable, busy, or fault (col. 5, lines 21-28). Nothing in Lee discloses a bit field map having a plurality of bits in which each one of the plurality of bits selects one of the corresponding plurality of ports as claimed.

In regards to point (D), examiner respectfully disagrees.

Column 4, lines 57-62, Lee discloses a plurality of DSPs having a different number of ports can be implemented. For example, the DSP 130 may have four DSPs and each DSP can support four ports to establish the data transmitting/receiving paths, including the path for transmitting a voice message according to the present invention (i.e. "plurality of bits in which each one of the plurality of bits selects one of the corresponding plurality of ports").

## **8. Conclusion**

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2157


extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to El Hadji M Sall whose telephone number is 571-272-4010. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4010.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

El Hadji Sall  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2157



**ARIO ETIENNE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**